

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

The examiner identified nine groups of invention as follows:

| <u>Group Numbers</u> | <u>Corresponding Figure Numbers</u> | <u>Corresponding Claim Numbers</u> |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Group 1 | Figs. 1a-1e | Claims 1, 12, and 14 |
| Group 2 | Figs. 2a-2d | |
| Group 3 | Figs. 3a-3e | Claim 13 |
| Group 4 | Figs. 4a-4e | Claims 4 and 5 |
| Group 5 | Figs. 5a-5h | Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 |
| Group 6 | Figs. 6a-6c | |
| Group 7 | Fig. 7 | |
| Group 8 | Figs. 8a-8b | Claims 10 and 11 |
| Group 9 | Figs. 9a-9b | |

Applicant provisionally elects the claims of Group 5, namely claims 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 which correspond to Figs. 5a-5h.

Applicant also traverses the Restriction Requirement on the basis that such requirement is inappropriate, in view of

- a) the examiner's finding of allowable subject matter in the December 19, 2007 Office Action for claims 3-5, 7-8 and 10-11, and,
- b) the Amendments filed April 21, 2008 by applicant clarified the claims in response to the examiner's previous rejection for indefiniteness.

It is noted that the examiner has found nine different groups of invention, but only Groups 1, 3-5 and 8 have claims that are identified by the examiner. The examiner has not identified corresponding claims for Groups 2, 6-7 and 9.

Thus, based on the examiner's identification of claims, only five of the nine groups listed by the examiner provide viable options for election by applicant.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is generic to the embodiments of Figs. 1-7. In addition applicant submits that claim 2 relates to Figs. 2 and 3, claim 3 relates to Fig. 6, claim 4 relates to Fig. 4, claim 5 relates to Fig. 1, claims 6, 7, and 8 relate to Fig. 5, claims 10, 11 and 14 relate to Figs. 8 and 9, and claim 12 relates to Figs. 1-7.

In addition applicant submits that the sealing strips defined in claim 13 are applicable to Figs. 1-9. Thus claim 13 relates to Figs. 1-9.

Applicant therefore requests that the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn, at least with respect to Figs. 1-7.

Applicant would also like to point out that the same male and female components present in Fig. 3 are also present in Fig. 5, although Fig. 5e additionally includes a releasable locking member 515.

Thus at the very least applicant respectfully requests that Groups 3 and 5 be combined.

In view of the foregoing remarks applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and simultaneous examination of Groups 3 and 5.

Dated: September 22, 2008

RODMAN & RODMAN
10 Stewart Place – Suite 2CE
White Plains, New York 10603

Telephone: (914) 949-7210
Facsimile: (914) 993-0668
1100-28 Response

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Rodman

Philip Rodman, Reg. No. 25,704
Attorney for Applicant